7: Gulick E-5 (1952) 1955 ME1 Lebanon ME1

specific, and are usually due to some such fact as the death of the father in his son's infancy. After she is married, a woman continues to be known by her own and her father's names, but if she is asked to give a family name, she will give her husband's rather than her father's family name (cf. Granqvist, 1950, p. 39).

The minimal lineages, then, are name groups. Each lineage name identifies its various bearers as members of a common descent group who are, *ipso facto*, relatives. When pressed, everyone who was asked admitted that he was also related to all the members of his maximal lineage, "and of course *all of us* in Mansūf return (*sirjū'*) to Manṣūr Jurjis al-Khūrī." Of these two wider connections, the latter, wider one seemed to be the stronger. In fact, many young adults were quite vague as to the maximal lineage affiliation of many of the minimal lineages. To put the matter in another way, it appears that in many cases a stronger identification is felt with the village as a kin group than with the maximal lineages. Even here, the writer would suggest that the sense of village identification is based possibly more on the interests of common residence than on the kinship bond of common descent from a very remote ancestor. At this point, the possibility must be raised that common descent from Manṣūr Jurjis al-Khūrī and the various descent patterns indicated in Table 8 and Figure 3 are partially or wholly fictional. As it is, it can be seen that the ultimate descent of Minimal Lineages XX and XXI are unknown or in dispute. But if it is fiction, it is nonetheless a significant symbol of the conceptual unity of the village, a conception which is put in terms of kinship. A basically similar concept is held by the people of Rasmiyah in regard to their genealogical origins (Zarour, 1953, p. 432).

Returning to the minimal lineages, we have seen that they identify by name people who are considered to be relatives. Several people said that the only relatives "who count" are the members of one's minimal lineage. In addition to this, however, matrilateral first cousins appear to count about equally as relatives. Discussion of this exception to patrilineal emphasis must be postponed till later in this chapter.

If, for our immediate purposes, lineage-mates are the only relatives who count, what do they count for? In a negative function, lineage-mates are people who should not marry each other. There is no strict rule about this, and marriages within minimal lineages do occur. They are, in fact, significantly numerous in lineage VIII, which is by far the largest lineage in the village (see Table 10). Having said this much, it must nevertheless be emphasized that marriages within a minimal lineage appear to be avoided in general. They could be much more frequent than they are without violation of the definite rule against the marriage of first cousins. In a positive function, lineage-mates may inherit from each other, whereas matrilateral relatives, no matter how close they may be, can never do so.

It cannot be said definitely that the minimal lineages have any more functions than those which have just been outlined. There are, apparently, no lineage heads, and if lineages ever act as units on any issue, no such behavior was observed or re-

7: Gulick E-5 (1952) 1955 ME1 Lebanon ME1

temporary or younger. It is of particular importance, of course, if ego's lineage mate who is so taken is a member of his or her immediate family. *Şahr* is used in exactly the same way by men and women. After a woman is married, she continues to use the term as she did before, but she also very often calls people *şahr* whom her husband calls *şahr*. This last point is another indication of the double family allegiance of a married woman.

Beyond this, we see that the use of the term is extended in two ways. First, it is extended to the male spouses of *all* first cousins. This is another indication of bilateral solidarity to the degree of first cousin but not beyond it, a striking phenomenon in a supposedly very strongly patrilineal system. Second, it is applied to any outsider who takes a wife from among the villagers. This usage is, in the writer's opinion, of the utmost significance. It says, in effect, that an outsider who marries a village girl is an in-law to everyone in the village, or, to the whole village as a collectivity of individuals. Either way it is phrased, it implies that the village as a unit is conceived of, or at least symbolized, as a single kin group. Of course, from the point of view of genealogy alone, this extended use of *şahr* is a perfectly logical projection from minimal lineage, through maximal lineage, to encompass the entire Core Group, which, by reason of universal descent from one man is, actually, a single superlineage. As a matter of fact, ego does not call *şahr* the husbands of his *maximal* lineage mates. This is another indication of the present-day conceptual weakness of the maximal lineages, a matter which can be readily accounted for (see Chap. 9).

One set of data on kinship terminology remains to be discussed. These are the reciprocal uses of *baabe* (cf. "daddy") and *maame* (cf. "mummy"). Within the immediate family, grown sons and daughters address their parents by these terms as well as the more formal *ḥayyi* and *ʾimmi*. In their turn, the parents reciprocate these terms in addressing their children, so that before one becomes accustomed to the practice, one is regularly startled to hear a mother address her son as *maame*. Reciprocation of the formal parental terms is much less common. Parents also use, of course, the formal terms for son and daughter in addressing their children. Davies, in fact, says that actually fathers do not address their daughters as *baabe* at all (1949, p. 251), but this usage was heard in Munşif. There is undoubtedly considerable individual variation in this practice. Davies says that there is a similar reciprocation of avuncular terms between aunts, uncles, and their nieces and nephews. The present writer has no evidence, one way or the other, of this usage in Munşif. Davies does not mention, however, a practice which does occur in Munşif, viz: the reciprocal use of *jiddi* and *sitti* (cf., in this context, "granddad" and "grandma") between grandparents and grandchildren. The terms *ḥafîd* (grandson) and *ḥafîdat* (granddaughter) are referential and are never used in direct address.

These familiar and familial usages are striking in that they seem to do violence to the facts of generation and sexual statuses. The phrase "seem to do violence" is

7: Gulick E-5 (1952) 1955 ME1 Lebanon ME1

used purposely here, for the reciprocal use of avuncular, parental, and grandparental terms by their respective referents is not meant literally by them nor is it to be taken literally in interpretation. These reciprocal usages are, it would seem, clear evidence of the semantic logic aspect of kinship terminology. In this case, the situation which is handled by the logic is the intense unity which is felt to bind close blood relatives together. And so, the argument with which this discussion began has come full circle. We can easily perceive that the reciprocal use of close familial terms is, from the functional point of view alone, "inconsistent," "dysfunctional," "misfunctional," and so on. Viewed in terms of a semantic system, however, the usage turns out to be the source of significant insights one of which is that the usage serves a consistent function. Where, then, is the controversy? The answer should be that there really is none, that both the functional and the linguistic points of view are valid and necessary in the interpretation of kinship systems.

One final point should be made. In actual practice, in Munqif, the use of personal names by elders addressing juniors and by contemporaries addressing each other is more frequent than the use of vocative kinship terms.

MARRIAGE

MARRIAGE PATTERNS

The Orthodox Church explicitly forbids the marriage of all types of first cousin. In Munqif this means that if two first cousins wish to be married, they cannot be married by the village priest. They may, however, appeal to the bishop of the district, and he is empowered to grant a dispensation. If he does, he performs the ceremony himself.

There is no formal rule for or against the marriage of a person to a member of his own minimal lineage. In Munqif, however, it is considered a better idea to marry outside the minimal lineage. The reason for this, according to one informant, is that all members of the minimal lineage are close relatives, and it is a poor idea for close relatives to marry because the children might be defective. The investigator volunteered the idea that, for example, a second cousin related to one through one's mother (wholly acceptable as a spouse) is more closely related as far as "blood" goes, after all, than a lineage-mate who is a fourth cousin. The informant did not deny the truth of this, but its significance was denied. Lineage-mates are all close relatives; matrilateral kin, except first cousins and their parents, are not. This is the villagers' definition of the situation.

At the present time, one's particular maximal lineage affiliation appears to have no bearing whatever on the choice of spouse. It is insignificant whether one marries inside or outside one's maximal lineage.

At this point, let us consider briefly Table 9 which indicates the closest degree of relationship, reckoned bilaterally, between the members of eighty-four married couples in *Munqif*. *Closest* degree of relationship is specified because many of

7: Gulick E-5 (1952) 1955 ME1 Lebanon ME1

teristic personality traits of a large number of Arabs. A few of these statements seem to be germane to this discussion.

Tannous (1944, p. 526) lists a number of Arab cultural themes two of which, in particular, are constantly reflected in individual personalities. One of these is hospitality, and the other is the predilection for the personal touch in human relationships.

Bonne (1948, p. 253), quoting from Havelin, characterizes the Syrians as spontaneous, impulsive, versatile, endowed with excellent memories and capacities for assimilation, but somewhat less endowed with initiative and perseverance.

Kohn (1956, p. 75) characterizes the Middle East villager as a "hard worker, cautious and suspicious, but with great natural intelligence." He also remarks on the "personal element" which, he says, coupled with "the tendency of likes and dislikes to outweigh rational and practical considerations, often leads to nepotism and to the granting of personal favors which interfere with the quality of administrative service" (*ibid.*, p. 83). He also notes quickness in comprehension, the gift of oratory, and deftness in the handling of other people (*ibid.*, pp. 83–84).

Thoumin (1936, p. 29) writes: "Neither Christianity nor Islam could ever modify the Syrian mentality, its mysticism (ascetic and voluptuous by turns), its passion for talk, and the pride of the individual in possessing a different faith from that of his neighbor" [author's translation.]

IN-GROUPS

The matter of in-groups in the culture of *Munjid* is one of central importance. A large amount of material has been given on it already, more will be said in Part Two; here the situation will be summarized very briefly.

There are three criteria for the formation of in-groups—three standards, as it were, around which the passions of loyalty and identification cluster. They are kinship, locality, and religion. These three criteria have led to the formation of four units of social structure. Kinship is the basis of the family and the lineage; locality is the primary basis of the village; religion is the primary basis of al-Qurni. To some degree the village is also a religious unit, and al-Qurni is also a local unit from the point of view of all its inhabitants.

Family, lineage, village, and Qurni—for any one individual these four form a series of in-groups of ever increasing inclusiveness from his family outwards. We should ordinarily be inclined to assume that the cohesiveness and solidarity of these units would vary inversely as their size and inclusiveness. In one respect, at least, this generalization does not appear to hold true for *Munjid*, for there are strong suggestions that to the average *Munjid*, the village as a whole is more meaningful as a unit than his particular minimal lineage, and this is unquestionably true as far as the maximal lineage is concerned. In this connection, it must be

7: Gulick E-5 (1952) 1955 ME1 Lebanon ME1

We can say, in summary, that the traditional theme of religion has in one aspect been weakened by acculturation, but that in another aspect it retains its traditional vigor.

Kinship. In the values surrounding kin groups, and by logical extension, the entire village group, *there have been almost no changes whatever.* In saying this, we arrive at the denouement of this work. The family and the lineage maintain their function of serving as a link between the individual and the village as a whole, which is, itself, a kin group toward which feelings of utmost loyalty and unity are directed.

The only suggestion of a weakening of the village *as* an in-group is the recent and increasing tendency toward village exogamy mostly on the part of women. This seems to be outstripped, however, by no diminution of feelings of village loyalty on the part of most of these women. Potentially, this tendency is a threat to the strength of the village because the children of these marriages will have no more than a sentimental attachment to it through their mothers. What effects this will have, or whether any counter-effects will be developed—these matters lie in the future.

Thus, that aspect of religion which has remained the most vigorous is precisely that aspect which, along with kinship, serves to define and identify loyalty groups. The remainder of this work will be devoted to an analysis of the question of why these in-groups, exemplified in multiple fashion by the village of Mansûf, have maintained their strength in a period of momentous cultural changes.

16: Gulick E-5 (1952)1954 MEI Lebanon MEI

be of any help. Then there was the flat statement that the shrines were no longer used at all. The most interesting comment was that many people still believed in the efficacy of the shrines but that they would probably deny it if they were asked because they had heard that such beliefs were a mark of ignorance. Actually, there was clear evidence that candles and olive oil are regularly burned as offerings at the shrines, but by how large a proportion of the people was not ascertained. In any case there is no doubt that there are now fundamental differences among the villagers on a matter which would not have been the subject of any disagreement 35 years ago.

In other aspects of life, religion plays a vigorous role. There are three types of occasion — weddings, and especially funerals and Easter — when all the villagers who are living away are strongly obligated to return to the village for the ceremonies. There is absolutely no question about this matter, in theory or in practice. The ritual occasions all have, of course, the same latent function, which is the intensification of group loyalty and solidarity sentiments. It can be argued that the prime motives behind these events which account for their vigor are not, strictly speaking, religious. Be that as it may, religious behavior is an integral part of the observances.

Kinship Organization. It appears that the kinship organization of al-Munsif has been the least affected by change of all the major aspects of the culture. It is often very difficult for modern Americans, in whose own culture kinship groups are of minimum importance, to comprehend the fact that in most other parts of the world kinship is one of the strongest elements in social organization. When we speak of the kinship organization of an Arab village, such as al-Munsif, we are not referring to a genealogical abstraction; we are referring, in fact, to the social organization itself. For the social organization — a pattern of interrelated statuses and roles — is defined in terms of kinship.

The unity of al-Munsif is enhanced by the fact that the villagers believe themselves all to be descended from a common ancestor who was the founder of the village. Whatever other differences there may develop among them, they continue to maintain this conception of themselves as a group. The founder had three sons among whom he divided equally the land of the community. For some time, the descendants of each of the three sons held land only in the areas originally apportioned. Each group, or lineage, also sponsored and developed one of the saint's shrines located in its territory. Eventually, the three original lineages were divided into what is now a total of 21 lineages. The name of each lineage is that of the man who is recognized as having been the common ancestor of all the members, but among the villagers themselves these lineage (or "family") names are rarely used. Their chief use is in filling out government and other official forms. A person is ordinarily designated by his own and his father's names only. Traditionally, the father's name is never given to any of his sons, and there is

only one exception to this rule in al-Mansūrī. In this case, the son was born while the family was living in Australia.

Special formal titles are addressed to no one except the priest, the mayor, the school teachers, and the doctor. Otherwise, personal names and kinship terms are used. It is significant that when a villager addresses another who is definitely his senior, he never under any circumstances uses the Arabic equivalents of "Mr." or "Mrs." To do this would be a grave insult, for it would imply that the person addressed is considered to be a stranger and an outsider. "Paternal uncle" or "aunt" are the kinship terms most commonly used in such cases (which include the address of one's father- and mother-in-law), although the well-known teknonymous formula (for example, "Abu 'Abdullah" — "father of 'Abdullah") is often employed. (It can also be used in a joking sense, but there is never any confusion in this matter.)

Space does not allow any further elaboration on the intricacies of the system of kinship terms which is used in al-Mansūrī. It can be said here only that these terms — which are verbal symbols of status and role — encompass the entire pattern of reciprocal obligations, social distance, and social interest which regulates interpersonal relations in the village. Over all, there is the abiding concept of everyone in the village being related. This is symbolized best, perhaps, by the extensive use of the term *ebn*. The basic meaning of this word is a man who has married a member of one's immediate family; in other words, a sister's or a daughter's husband. But the term is extended to any man (of some age or younger) who is married to a member of one's lineage, and it is applied to an outsider who has married any village girl. Conceptually, the outsider becomes an in-law of the entire community.

The lineages function as units of identification by name (if necessary), as units for the automatic support and aid of individual members on a reciprocal basis, and to some extent for the regulation of marriage. Marriage to a member of another lineage is preferred, provided the spouse is a member of the village. There are exceptions to this, but as a whole, the network of marriage ties — which become blood ties through women in the generations following the marriage — between the lineages is very complex. Thus the potential exclusiveness of each lineage is minimized for the benefit of village solidarity. There are, indeed, factions and cliques within the village, but its basic unity is never lost sight of.

The Arabs are often thought of as actually living their daily lives in large, extended family groups. This is not, and apparently never has been, true in al-Mansūrī. All the households, with one exception, consist of what sociologists call "nuclear" families. That is, they are composed, basically, of only the parents and the immature or unmarried children. But the resemblance to the typical American family ends at this point, for though

by the people, and criticized by higher religious authorities. Through unspecified literatures, members of the community mark his words. In some cases, he does not even cease to be an active farmer. A balance is established between the central religious organization of the country and the village church through respect for local autonomy.

Another pillar of life among the rural people of Lebanon is the family organization, which is characterized by three functional units or stages. The first of these is the primary biological unit, consisting of the married couple and their children. The second is a more comprehensive unit, known as the joint family, which consists of the grandparents as the head, their unmarried daughters, and the various families of their sons. At a certain point in its growth, this joint family breaks up into new units, emitting ultimately in the development of the largest family organization, the kinship group. Members of this group claim descent from the same ancestor and normally carry his name.

Evidences of the importance of the family organization are numerous and convincing. A village consists usually of a community of people held together to a large extent by blood ties, either through descent within the kinship group or through intermarriage between these units. Practically everybody is related directly or indirectly to everybody else. A strong sense of belonging and of solidarity develops as a result. Marriage, to a large extent, is a family affair, with emphasis upon the interests and welfare of the two family groups concerned. Children are usually named after ancestors or other relatives, thus emphasizing the blood tie. Land is normally held and operated jointly by various members of the unit. Loyalty to the family in times of crisis is binding; family honor and prestige must be upheld.

In their use of proverbs, expressing fundamental attitudes, the village folk frequently refer to this family relationship. "Blood can never turn into water." "A boy is two-thirds the image of his uncle." "Marry the daughter of a good family, though she be an old maid." "He who has no family backing has no backbone." These are but a few examples. Further evidence of the identification of the individual with the family group is supplied by the manner in which people are addressed or introduced.